




# OHIO'S DRAINAGE LAWS

— AN OVERVIEW —

186/16



*...how water rights problems related to drainage  
are addressed in Ohio*



Ohio Cooperative Extension Service  
The Ohio State University



## AUTHORS

### Larry C. Brown

Assistant Professor  
Extension Agricultural Engineer  
Agricultural Engineering Department

### Jodi L. Stearns

Private Attorney  
Wood County, Ohio

The contributions of Byron H. Nolte, Professor Emeritus and former Extension Agricultural Engineer, are gratefully appreciated.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Partial support for this publication was provided by the Water Resources Educational Materials Project funded by the Innovative Grant Program of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, and the Overholt Drainage Education and Research Program, Department of Agricultural Engineering, The Ohio State University.

The authors thank the following for their review of this publication: Robert Holmes, Professor, Department of Agricultural Engineering, The Ohio State University; Leonard Black, Water Resource Planner, Division of Water, ODNR; Kevin Elder, Project Coordinator, Division of Soil and Water Conservation, ODNR; Joseph W. Diemert, Private Attorney, Cleveland, OH.

A special thanks is given to Judy Kauffeld and Lauren V. Farr (Section of Information and Applied Communications, OCES) for editorial and graphic production.



For Sale Publication

Copyright © 1991 The Ohio State University

9/91 — 3M — 89580

Issued in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, Acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bobby D. Moser, Director of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, The Ohio State University.

All educational programs and activities conducted by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service are available to all potential clientele on a non-discriminatory basis without regard to race, color, creed, religion, sexual orientation, national origin, sex, age, handicap or Vietnam-era veteran status.

## OHIO'S DRAINAGE LAWS — AN OVERVIEW

Agricultural producers and landowners in humid areas like Ohio are concerned with the need to dispose of excess water. For agricultural producers, excess water can mean delayed planting, spring flooding and replanting, delayed cultivations, soil compaction and delayed harvesting. About 57 percent of Ohio's cropland acres are naturally poorly drained. According to the 1987 National Resources Inventory (USDA-SCS, 1989), Ohio has about 12.5 million acres of cropland. Approximately 50 percent of these acres have received drainage improvement, but another 3.5 million acres need improved drainage. In contrast, nearly all urban areas require stormwater management. For the private landowner in rural and urban areas, excess water can mean damage to the landscape, mudslides, basement and property flooding, and, in some cases, extensive damage to or loss of the dwelling.

Competition for various uses of Ohio's water resources has grown in recent years, as was seen during the 1988 drought. However, 1990 was the wettest year in 108 years of records, with more than 51 inches of precipitation. Therefore, after a series of "dry" years, the wet springs of 1989 and 1990 have again drawn much attention to the need for Ohio landowners to better understand their rights to dispose of or drain excess water. The disposal of excess water continues to be very important from an economic standpoint. Public awareness of the importance of excess water disposal and the environmental consequences is rapidly increasing. Water rights laws as they relate to the disposal of excess water in the rural and urban areas of Ohio are very complex. The existing laws have been under development for a long period of time and will continue to be reviewed and updated.

This publication presents a brief overview of the rights of Ohio landowners to dispose of excess water and the legal mechanisms by which to do so. Some interesting Ohio decisions and opinions written since the mid-1950s are included. Major references are Callahan (1979), Nolte (1985a), the Ohio Revised Code (ORC), and Wright et al. (1985). This publication is intended to provide the reader with insight into how water rights problems related to drainage are addressed in Ohio. It is not intended to provide strict legal interpretation. Note: Legal citations are italicized and footnoted in the text. Footnotes are presented on page 14.

### RIGHTS TO DISPOSE OF EXCESS WATER

There are various methods that can be employed to solve drainage problems. In some cases, the extent of the improvement may only involve an individual landowner and one parcel of land. In others, improvements may involve several landowners and even communities, and land areas in the thousands of acres. Each situation is a separate case and should be judged on its own merit.

*... 1990 was the wettest year in 108 years of records, with more than 51 inches of precipitation.*



*When correcting an existing drainage problem involves more than one landowner, the owners may mutually agree to cooperate to provide the necessary drainage improvements.*

#### MECHANISMS FOR DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENT

When correcting an existing drainage problem involves more than one landowner, the owners may mutually agree to cooperate to provide the necessary drainage improvements. The Ohio County Ditch Law provides for the mutual agreement procedure, which is used frequently in Ohio. The mutual agreement procedure provides for: plans to be filed with the county clerk, along with information on the proposed costs; review by the county engineer; and placement of the improvement in a permanent maintenance program conducted by the county government. This procedure is one of the simplest mechanisms by which to make a drainage improvement involving one or more landowners.

There are other legal provisions for carrying out drainage improvements when more than one landowner is involved. These include:

1) The Ohio County Ditch Law, commonly referred to as the Ohio Drainage Laws, presently consists of Chapters 6131, 6133, 6135, and 6137 of the ORC. There have been extensive amendments to the County Ditch Law (first enacted around 1850) passed in 1957 and 1981. Chapter 6131 addresses "County Ditches," 6133 addresses "Joint County Ditches," 6135 addresses "Interstate County Ditches," and 6137 addresses "Ditch Maintenance Fund." Chapter 6131 is probably most relevant to private landowners in Ohio. Drainage improvement procedures based on these chapters are outlined by Nolte (1985b).

2) The Ohio Conservancy District Law (Chapter 6101 of the ORC), originally designed to address flood control, was broadened to authorize drainage improvements. The original Conservancy District law was enacted in 1914. These provisions have been used independently and in conjunction with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 83-566, as described in OCES (1970). Public Law 83-566, commonly called PL-566, only provides planning and financial assistance.

3) Conservation Improvement Projects Through Soil and Water Conservation Districts (Chapter 1515 of the ORC) is the authority for the Soil and Water Conservation Districts to construct improvement projects, and specifically addresses the disposal of water. This mechanism has been available since 1969. These provisions, as outlined by Nolte and Derickson (1980), are sometimes referred to as Senate Bill 160 projects.

Some of the mechanisms mentioned above have been revised frequently and additional changes are continually being recommended. The last revision of the Ohio County Ditch Law was through House Bill 282, July 5, 1983.

## THE BASIC DOCTRINES FOR DECISIONS

Three separate rules of law have been developed and applied by Ohio courts over the years to determine the legal rights and responsibilities of landowners to dispose of excess water (Callahan, 1979; Wright et al., 1985). These are the common enemy doctrine, the civil law doctrine and the doctrine of reasonable use. The discussion on the common enemy and civil law doctrines that follows is intended to provide the reader a historical perspective on past court decisions that led to the present application of the reasonable use doctrine.

The common enemy doctrine, which generally has been applied to urban areas, gives an individual landowner the unqualified right to dispose of water. The underlying theory is that these waters are the common enemy of man to be fought off by each property owner as he/she sees fit. If one follows this theory, water could be disposed of without regard to the consequences to adjoining landowners.

The civil law doctrine, which in the past generally applied to rural areas, requires the lower landowner to accept the natural water flow, but prohibits the upper landowner from changing the natural drainage, thereby increasing the burden on the lower landowner. The underlying principle is that lower lands are servient to upper lands with respect to receiving the natural flow of diffused surface water.

Ohio common law defines surface water as water diffused over the ground and derived from falling rain and melting snow; the water retains its status as surface water until it reaches a well-defined channel in which it merges with other waters. At this point, surface waters become part of the running waters of a stream and cease to be surface waters (*Crawford v. Rambo*<sup>1</sup>). The term diffused surface water, simply stated, is water spread over the ground surface; it is not concentrated in a well-defined channel.

Although Ohio courts had adopted the civil law doctrine for application to drainage of surface waters of rural lands, they held that it did not apply to urban areas. Since the Franklin County Court of Appeals decided the case of *Lunsford v. Stewart*<sup>2</sup> in 1953, many courts have applied the reasonable use doctrine to reach decisions related to surface water drainage in urban areas. *Lunsford v. Stewart* involved an urban landowner who filled and built structures on his city lot that diverted the natural flow of water from the adjoining lot. The judgment in *Lunsford v. Stewart* was based in part on the reasonable use doctrine. Earlier Ohio courts generally applied the common enemy doctrine for “city” drainage, but this rule had not been applied in all cases.

*Three separate rules of law have been developed and applied  
by Ohio courts over the years to determine the legal rights  
and responsibilities of landowners to dispose of excess water.*



“A landowner is not unqualifiedly privileged to deal  
with surface water as he/she sees fit ....”

As Ohio has undergone the strains of urban and rural development, the courts have adopted many modifications and exceptions to the civil law and common enemy doctrines. In addressing the problems of applying these two doctrines, the court's reasonable use doctrine has evolved to provide flexibility and practicality to application of Ohio's drainage laws. The reasonable use doctrine essentially provides that an acceleration or an obstruction of surface water flow should be examined to determine whether or not the change is “reasonable” in the particular case. In 1980, the Ohio Supreme Court applied the reasonable use doctrine in the case of *McGlashan v. Spade Rockledge Corp.*<sup>3</sup> The high court defined the rights of landowners as follows: “A landowner is not unqualifiedly privileged to deal with surface water as he/she sees fit, nor is he/she absolutely prohibited from interfering with the natural flow of surface waters to the detriment of others. A possessor of land is legally privileged to make a reasonable use of his/her land even though the flow of water is altered, thereby causing harm to others.” (*McGlashan v. Spade Rockledge Corp.* will be discussed further in a later section.) The reasonable use doctrine has been applied to a number of cases in Ohio since 1953. For more reading on the progression of Ohio courts toward application of the reasonable use rule, the reader is referred to interpretative summaries provided in the University of Cincinnati Law Review (1980) and Capital University Law Review (1980).

### PROVISIONS, DECISIONS AND OPINIONS OF INTEREST

The Ohio General Assembly has provided a mechanism for groups of landowners to equitably share the costs of change when a procedure to improve drainage is followed, as set forth in the Ohio County Ditch Law. The Ohio County Ditch Law provides that upstream landowners may be assessed to help pay the cost of channel improvement necessary to discharge the accelerated flow due to man-made causes (Section 6131.01 ORC). An assessment is possible only when a petitioned improvement is being carried out as provided by the Ohio County Ditch Law. (The Ohio County Ditch Law assessment procedure was recently tested and upheld in an Ohio district court of appeals, and the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Kunkle, et al. v. Fulton County Board of Commissioners, et al.*<sup>4</sup>, January 1991.) However, in most situations, a landowner must utilize the courts to collect for damages caused by either upstream or downstream drainage alterations.

Legal controversy frequently arises when damage is caused by a watercourse overflowing onto a lower landowner's property. Traditionally, Ohio courts have held that the upper landowner is not liable if the overflow is from a natural watercourse. In 1964, the Ohio Supreme Court held in *Munn v. Horvitz*<sup>5</sup> that “upland owners may place flowing surface waters in a natural watercourse at such

increased rate as the upland owners desire, so long as no additional waters from outside the watershed are included in such flow, without incurring any liability from downstream owners.” *Munn v. Horvitz* involved a private landowner and the construction of a municipal storm sewer in the city of Mayfield Heights. However, an appellate court ruled in 1968, in the case of *Johnston v. Miller*<sup>6</sup>, that an upper landowner incurs liability if he/she collects water by artificial drainage (such as tiles and pipes) and then discharges it into a watercourse in quantities that exceed, and at points that differ from, the natural drainage flow, even if his/her actions are reasonable.

The *Munn v. Horvitz*<sup>5</sup> decision was modified in *Masley v. Lorain*<sup>7</sup>, a 1976 case involving a municipal storm sewer in the city of Lorain and four property owners. The Ohio Supreme Court held that “the construction and operation of a municipal storm sewer so as to cause material damage to a downstream landowner, as a result of flooding from rains or other causes which are reasonably foreseeable, is a direct encroachment upon that land which subjects it to a public use that excludes or restricts the landowner’s dominion and control over his land, and such owner has a right to compensation for the property taken under Section 19, Article I of the Ohio Constitution.” The two important phrases in the decision are “cause material damage” and “are reasonably foreseeable.” In this particular case, the city of Lorain had used Martin Run Creek as part of its storm sewer system. An engineering firm had recommended to the city that stream improvement to Martin Run Creek was necessary downstream from the storm sewer outlet to carry the increased water flow. The city of Lorain did not follow the recommendation.

## REASONABLE USE

In recent years, the Ohio Supreme Court appears to have adopted the reasonable-use rule as the basis for court decisions involving disposition of surface water. In the 1976 case of *Chudzinski v. Sylvania*<sup>8</sup> involving accelerated runoff from a shopping center that caused downstream damages on private property, the appeals court decision provided a detailed statement of the reasonable use rule. In 1977 the village of Mayfield, in *Myotte v. Mayfield*<sup>9</sup>, was found liable for injury for permitting construction of an industrial complex causing flooding of a lower riparian’s land by greatly increased runoff of surface water. The court found that the village knew of a flooding problem prior to permitting construction and failed to implement a solution so that increased flow from the industrial park could be accommodated. After a review of the common enemy and civil law doctrines, and information about the stream capacity, the court of appeals chose to apply the “broader, more flexible rule of reasonableness.”

*... the court’s reasonable use doctrine has evolved to provide flexibility and practicality to application of Ohio’s drainage laws.*



... the *McGlashan v. Spade Rockledge Corp.* ruling has been interpreted to be very strong and diminishes the strength of the common enemy and civil law doctrines.

The court's 1980 decision in *McGlashan v. Spade Rockledge Corp.*<sup>3</sup> appears to be dominant in support of application of the reasonable use doctrine. A developer had begun construction of condominiums in the city of Broadview Heights before completing a new drainage system to take care of the altered drainage. An August rainstorm occurred, causing excess runoff from cleared land that carried mud, rocks and other debris onto adjoining property and causing flooding of basements. The Ohio Supreme Court found the developer liable for damages. The court's declaration further stated that the Court adopts a reasonable use rule to be used in resolving surface water controversies as follows: "A possessor of land is not unqualifiedly privileged to deal with surface water as he pleases, nor is he absolutely prohibited from interfering with the natural flow of surface waters to the detriment of others. Each possessor is legally privileged to make a reasonable use of his land, even though the flow of surface waters is altered thereby and causes some harm to others. He incurs liability only when his harmful interference with the flow of surface water is unreasonable. In determining the reasonableness of an interference, the trier of fact is to be guided by the rules stated in 4 Restatement on Torts 2d 108-142, Sections 822-831." The court cited *Lunsford v. Stewart*<sup>2</sup>, *Munn v. Horvitz*<sup>5</sup>, *Chudzinski v. Sylvania*<sup>8</sup>, and *Myotte v. Mayfield*<sup>9</sup> in making its decision.

Four cases, *Lunsford v. Stewart*<sup>2</sup>, *Masley v. Lorain*<sup>7</sup>, *Myotte v. Mayfield*<sup>9</sup>, and *McGlashan v. Spade Rockledge Corp.*<sup>3</sup> are important cases that set certain precedents. In particular, the *McGlashan v. Spade Rockledge Corp.* ruling has been interpreted to be very strong and diminishes the strength of the common enemy and civil law doctrines. Three of the cases mentioned above were recently cited in a court of appeals ruling that upheld a lower court decision in the case of *Huggins Farms, Inc. v. Bucyrus Plaza Ltd., et al.*<sup>10</sup> in May of 1989. This unreported Crawford County case involved the interference with surface water drainage that resulted in the regular flooding of 20 acres of land. The court ruled that the interference was unreasonable.

In 1981, the Court of Appeals of Cuyahoga County applied the reasonable use rule in *Accurate Die Casting Co. v. Cleveland*<sup>11</sup>. In this case, a municipality imposed its storm sewer system on a natural watercourse, subsequently causing flood damage to a commercial business. This case is noteworthy, not only because of the application of reasonable use, but the decision that the defense of sovereign immunity does not preclude liability for damages caused by a municipality's negligent design of its storm sewer system. This ruling was appealed to the Ohio Supreme Court, which would not hear the appeal, thereby supporting the appeals court decision.



## URBAN SEDIMENT AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Various organizations have developed stormwater runoff control criteria. In 1977, the Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission recommended that the peak rate of runoff from an area after development shall not exceed the peak rate of runoff from the same area before development for all storms up to a 100-year frequency, 24-hour storm (Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, 1977). The 100-year, 24-hour storm is a 4.6-inch to 5.7-inch rainfall in Ohio. Wayne County adopted similar criteria for storms from a 2-year to 100-year frequency (McCullough, 1979).

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Soil and Water Conservation, adopted Rule 1501:15-1-06 of the ORC to recommend control of accelerated erosion in urban areas effective November 1, 1979 (House Bill 513). Since then, many local governments (county, township and/or municipal) have adopted programs to address urban stormwater and sediment problems. Township activities are permissible as long as the township rules do not conflict with county or state statutes as stated in Ohio Attorney General's Opinion Number 85-053, September 17, 1985 (USDA-SCS, 1987). Delaware County adopted urban sediment pollution and water runoff control regulations (March, 1981) requiring the person developing a site to petition the county for permanent maintenance of structures and other facilities when two or more property owners benefit. Similar approaches have been initiated in other areas in Ohio. As of February 1986, 24 counties, 63 municipalities and 6 townships in Ohio had adopted local standards for urban sediment and stormwater management (USDA-SCS, 1987). This USDA publication contains a list of these counties, municipalities and townships.

There are other provisions of the Ohio Revised Code that address drainage problems. Section 3767.13 of the ORC, in the Nuisances Law, prohibits any person from unlawfully diverting a watercourse from its natural course or state in a way that injures or prejudices others. The penalty for violation of Section 3767.13 is a third-degree misdemeanor. A common pleas court can enjoin such a diversion as a nuisance upon the bringing of legal action by the Attorney General, the county prosecuting attorney, or a citizen of the county (Ohio Legislative Service Commission, 1977; USDA-SCS, 1987).

## STORMWATER MANAGEMENT UTILITIES

The Ohio Revised Code provides for the establishment of stormwater management utilities, which are usually funded through a tax levy that is approved through referendum. Under Section 727.012 of the ORC, a municipality

*... the Nuisances Law prohibits any person from unlawfully  
diverting a watercourse from its natural course or state in a way  
that injures or prejudices others.*



---

*Concerns often arise when subsurface drains that were  
constructed by mutual agreement need  
maintenance or reconstruction.*

can initiate action that allows for an assessment based on a percentage of tax value, an assessment in proportion to the benefits to the property, or an assessment based on the front footage of the property (Nolte, 1983).

In June of 1985, Cincinnati adopted a stormwater management code that authorized collection of storm drainage service charges on developed land to finance a storm water management system (Nolte, 1985a). The idea of stormwater utilities started in the western U.S., and the Cincinnati district is the first established east of the Mississippi (Johnson, 1990). In addition to Cincinnati, stormwater utilities have been established in Forest Park (1988), Montpelier (1986), Union (1987), Upper Arlington (1990), Wooster (1985) and Zanesville (1987). The cities of Canal Winchester, Columbus, Delaware, Mayfield, Newark and Toledo are presently investigating the implementation of stormwater utilities (Johnson, 1990).

#### **MAINTENANCE AND/OR RECONSTRUCTION**

Very few of the cases mentioned above dealt with agricultural drainage systems within farm fields. Concerns often arise when subsurface drains that were constructed by mutual agreement need maintenance or reconstruction. The following describes a case where an existing subsurface drainage system needed repair.

A landowner wanted to replace a 5-inch tile that drained a portion of his/her property with a 6-inch tile to meet current drainage criteria. The 5-inch line crossed a downstream owner's land a distance of 250 feet to an open ditch. No written easement had been secured and recorded for the original 5-inch tile. The original tile had been in place for more than 50 years, but no agreement could be reached by the two landowners to allow its replacement with a 6-inch tile. The issue was taken to the township trustees as provided in Section 6139.06 of the ORC. The trustees approved the change and awarded \$150 in damages to the lower owner. (Section 6139.06 was re-appealed effective April 9, 1981.) In 1977, a court of appeals heard the case as *Wilkins v. Sitterley*<sup>12</sup> and found no proof that the subsurface drain was conducive to public welfare, and the showing of such proof is required by the statute. The court held that the prescriptive easement right created by the existence of the 5-inch tile at its present location for a period of 50 years gave the upper owner the right to repair and maintain the 5-inch tile in its present size and location subject to damages to the lower owner, but it could not be enlarged. A prescriptive easement is simply the right to use another's property that is not inconsistent with the owner's right and that is acquired by a use that is open, notorious, adverse and continuous for the statutory period (Black, 1979). According to Ohio case law, the minimum period required to acquire a prescriptive easement is 21 years.

## WETLANDS

In recent years, major national and local attention has focused on conservation of wetlands. There are many complex issues to address related to drainage improvements and the protection of unique ecosystems. Numerous state and federal agencies are involved in some aspect of wetland protection. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the USDA Soil Conservation Service (SCS) and Agricultural Stabilization Conservation Service, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, and various divisions in the Ohio Department of Natural Resources. It is beyond the scope of this publication to address fully the complex issues associated with drainage improvements and the conservation of existing wetlands in Ohio. However, if there are questions in this area, the reader is advised to contact the agencies listed above. A good place to start is with the county Extension office or the local USDA-SCS District Conservationist.

## ALTERNATIVES

In almost all the cases and procedures mentioned in this publication, the landowner must initiate the action to resolve the drainage dispute or make the drainage improvement. This publication has mentioned at least seven basic alternatives an individual landowner might consider to resolve a drainage problem. These are summarized below, but not necessarily in order of importance or choice.

- The landowner may work voluntarily with other landowners involved in the same drainage problem, and try to work out an agreement to pay the necessary costs and construct the improvements.
- The voluntary group may construct the needed improvement, and then apply to the Board of County Commissioners to place the improvement in a maintenance program under the provisions of the Ohio County Ditch Laws (ORC Section 6131.63). Under this alternative, the improvement ideally would be maintained perpetually from funds collected through assessments.
- The landowner may apply for assistance through the conservation works of improvement procedure of the Soil and Water Conservation District, and pay assessments for improvement construction and maintenance (Senate Bill 160 projects).
- The landowner may petition for the improvement under the Ohio County Ditch Laws (ORC Chapter 6131). If the petition is approved, the landowner should expect to pay assessments for his/her portion of the construction costs for the improvement, as well as assessments for perpetual maintenance.
- A drainage improvement district may be funded through a tax levy approved through a referendum.
- The landowner may consult a qualified attorney to present a case for getting the drainage problem resolved in a court of law. Most often the landowner is trying to collect damages resulting from the neglect of others to properly address a drainage problem.

... each case is judged on its own merit ... each case may have specifics that are unique.

- Landowners may choose to do nothing and accept the consequences, such as continued flooding, flood damage, etc., and possible future litigation by a third party. Many landowners do select this alternative.

## SUMMARY

This publication has presented a brief overview of Ohio's drainage laws. The examples and cases discussed herein are not inclusive of all such cases or examples relating to the problems associated with the drainage of excess water. The reader should understand that each case is judged on its own merit, and that each case may have specifics that are unique.

Water rights laws addressing disposal of excess water in Ohio are complex. This publication is intended to help the reader better understand how water rights problems related to drainage are addressed in Ohio. Its intent is not to provide strict legal interpretation. Because of the complex nature of the water rights laws in Ohio as they pertain to disposal of excess water, the help of a qualified attorney may be necessary for one to fully understand how these laws may apply to individual situations.

## WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

In each county, there are numerous sources of information on water rights related to drainage. These include: the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, the Soil and Water Conservation District, the local library, the county engineer's office, the county prosecuting attorney's office, and offices of private attorneys. However, the actual availability of any information may vary greatly from county to county, and office to office. The following is a guide to locating some of the information referenced in this publication.

- All publications published by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, and currently in print, are available through the county Extension office.
- The report by Callahan (1979) provides a more complete treatment of Ohio water rights up until about 1978, and the bulletin by Wright et al. (1985) serves as a reference to a number of water rights cases. Both of these publications are out of print, but are on file at: ODNR, Division of Soil and Water Conservation or Division of Water, Fountain Square, Columbus, OH 43224; Department of Agricultural Engineering, The Ohio State University; and possibly at some university and public libraries.
- Copies of the chapters and sections of the Ohio Revised Code cited in this publication may be obtained at most university libraries, public libraries, county law libraries and possibly at some county prosecuting attorneys' and county engineers' offices. The Ohio Revised Code is published and updated frequently.

- Copies of individual court decisions can be obtained at some university and public libraries, and at most law libraries. However, for most recent local decisions, the reader may need to consult the county prosecuting attorney's office, the office of the clerk of county courts or the office of the clerk of the particular district or state court of interest. The length of time for the written description of a local ruling to get into publication, and then into the library system, can be several years. Some local decisions are filed only in the clerk of courts office where the case was heard. If a local case goes unreported, it is usually regarded by legal professional publishers as having, or setting, little or no precedence. Most cases go unreported. Although these cases have less importance on a statewide basis, they may have great importance in the local court where the decision was made.

- The Ohio Legislative Service Commission (Columbus, OH) can furnish copies of legislation under consideration by the Ohio House and Senate. Each year, the House and Senate consider various articles of legislation related to drainage and stormwater management. The Legislative Service Commission also maintains a library of documents published by the commission.

- The USDA-SCS (1987) stormwater management manual is available in local SWCD offices.

## REFERENCES AND ASSOCIATED PUBLICATIONS

- Black, H.C. 1979. Black's Law Dictionary. 5th Edition. West Publishing Co., St. Paul, MN.
- Callahan, C. C. 1979. Principles of Water Rights Law in Ohio. Division of Water, Dept. of Natural Resources, State of Ohio, Columbus, OH. (Out of print).
- Capital University Law Review. 1980. Vol 10:213-219.
- Franklin County Engineer. 1990. Responsibility and Procedure of Improvement and Maintenance of Drains, Ditches and Watercourses. Issued by John Circle, County Engineer, in cooperation with the Board of County Commissioners. Franklin County, OH.
- Johnson, Stanley E. 1990. Personal communication. Chief Engineer, Burgess and Niple, Ltd. Columbus, OH.
- McCullough, William D. 1979. Wayne County Engineering Code for Subdivision Development. Wayne County Engineering Dept., Wooster OH.
- Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission. 1977. Stormwater Technical Design Manual. Report by Burgess and Niple, Ltd. Columbus OH.
- Nolte, B.H. 1983. Drainage and Stormwater — Responsibility and Funding. Presented at the Summer Meeting, County Engineers Association of Ohio, Dayton, Ohio, June 21, 1983.
- Nolte, B. H. 1985a. Water Rights Laws in Ohio. Presented at the SCS Ohio Urban Workshop, Cincinnati OH, October 22-23, 1985.
- Nolte, B. H. 1985b. The Ohio Drainage Laws Petition Procedure. Bulletin 482, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, The Ohio State Univ., Columbus OH.
- Nolte, B. H. and E. H. Derickson. 1980. Conservation Improvement Projects Through Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Bulletin 606, Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, Ohio State Univ., Columbus OH.

- OCES. 1970. Developing Ohio Watersheds through Public Law 566. Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, The Ohio State University.
- ODNR. 1972. Northeast Ohio Water Plan (1972), Main Report, Ohio Dept. of Natural Resources, Columbus OH, November, 1972.
- ODNR. 1980. Urban Soil Sediment Pollution Control, Model Regulations. April 1980. Division of Soil and Water Conservation, ODNR. Columbus, OH. 43224.
- ODNR. 1986. Ohio Stream Management Guide. ODNR, Fountain Square, Columbus, OH. 43224.
- ODNR. 1989. Agricultural Sediment Pollution Abatement Rules. Effective May 1, 1989. Division of Soil and Water Conservation, ODNR, Fountain Square, Columbus, OH. 43224
- Ohio Legislative Service Commission. 1977. Suburban Drainage. Staff Research Report No. 124, State House, Columbus, OH, June 1977.
- Ohio Legislative Service Commission. 1955. Water Rights in Ohio. Research Report No. 1.
- USDA-ERS. 1987. Farm Drainage in the United States. History, Status, and Prospects. USDA-Economic Research Service. Misc. Publication No. 1455.
- USDA-SCS. 1989. National Resource Inventory (1987). USDA-Soil Conservation Service.
- USDA-SCS. 1987. Ohio's Urban Sediment and Stormwater Management Control Program. Chapter 2 In: Water Management and Sediment Control for Urbanizing Areas.
- University of Cincinnati Law Review. 1980. Vol 49:914-925.
- Wright, P. L., J. L. Stearns, and T. E. Muth. 1985 (revised). Water rights in Ohio. Farm Management Handbook. Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, The Ohio State University. (Out of print).

## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> *Crawford v. Rambo*, 44 Ohio St. 279 (1886).
- <sup>2</sup> *Lunsford v. Stewart*, 95 Ohio App. 383 (1953).
- <sup>3</sup> *McGlashan v. Spade Rockledge Corp.*, 62 Ohio St. 2d 55 (1980).
- <sup>4</sup> *Kunkle, et al. v. Fulton County Board of Commissioners, et al.*, Case No. 90-3261, U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Decision filed January 8, 1991.
- <sup>5</sup> *Munn v. Horvitz*, 175 Ohio St. 521, 196 N.E. 2d 764 (1964).
- <sup>6</sup> *Johnston v. Miller*, 15 Ohio App. 2d 233 (1968).
- <sup>7</sup> *Masley v. Lorain*, 48 Ohio St. 2d 334 (1976).
- <sup>8</sup> *Chudzinski v. Sylvania*, 53 Ohio App. 2d 151 (1976).
- <sup>9</sup> *Myotte v. Mayfield*, 54 Ohio App. 2d 97 (1977).
- <sup>10</sup> *Huggins Farms, Inc. v. Bucyrus Plaza Ltd., et al.*, Case No. 3-86-4, Third District Court of Appeals. Decision filed in Crawford County, Ohio, May 9, 1989.
- <sup>11</sup> *Accurate Die Casting Co. v. Cleveland*, 2 Ohio App. 3d 386 (1981).
- <sup>12</sup> *Wilkins v. Sitterley*, Fifth District Court of Appeals. Decision filed in Fairfield County, Ohio, March 28, 1977.

A SPECIAL REQUEST

Many readers of this publication have been or are currently involved in resolving a drainage problem. Some may have knowledge and information about other drainage problems and local court cases. If you have accurate and factual information that you would like to pass along, please send copies of those materials to the author of this publication. These materials may be very useful in helping other Ohio citizens better understand how to address drainage problems, and possibly resolve drainage disputes. Thanks for your help.

MY LIST OF INTERESTING CASES

Use the space below to document other legal cases you may find of interest.

Date	U.S., Ohio, or County Court	Case Number	Names of Persons/ Entities Involved	Comments



PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER